



*DPW*  
MAIL STOP  
AMENDMENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: J.-S. Mok et al. Attorney Docket No.: LEPA121687  
Application No.: 10/677,182 Art Unit: 1765 / Confirmation No.: 8329  
Filed: October 2, 2003 Examiner: S. Ahmed  
Title: METHOD OF FORMING SOLDER RESIST PATTERNS

**RESPONSE TRANSMITTAL LETTER**

August 24, 2005

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

A. Response Transmittal

Transmitted herewith is a response in the above-identified application. No additional claim fee is required.

B. Additional Fee Charges or Credit for Overpayment

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.18 which may be required during the entire pendency of the application, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 03-1740. This authorization also hereby includes a request for any extensions of time of the appropriate length required upon the filing of any reply during the entire prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>

Laura A. Cruz  
Registration No. 46,649  
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1725

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date: 8/24/05

LXC:nfs

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100



MAIL STOP  
AMENDMENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: J.-S. Mok et al. Attorney Docket No.: LEPA121687  
Application No.: 10/677,182 Art Unit: 1765 / Confirmation No: 8329  
Filed: October 2, 2003 Examiner: S. Ahmed  
Title: METHOD OF FORMING SOLDER RESIST PATTERN

**RESPONSE**

Seattle, Washington 98101

August 24, 2005

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Currently, Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 have been examined and stand rejected. Reconsideration of Claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

**The Rejection of Claims 7-9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner states that "the phrase 'a multilayer printed circuit board fabricated in a parallel manner' renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear what is meant by 'a parallel manner.'"

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants believe that a claim is not rendered indefinite if a phrase is described in the application such that a person skilled in the art would understand the meaning of the phrase. By "parallel manner," applicants are referring to a specific method of forming a printed circuit board, in which a circuit layer and an insulating layer are separately formed, and the layers are alternately disposed and pressed. See page 16, lines 10-12. For an example, see also page 22, line 10, through page 24, line 6, with reference to FIGURES 6A-6F.

"If the claims, read in light of the specification, reasonably apprise those skilled in the art both of the utilization and scope of the invention, and if the language is as precise as the subject matter permits, the courts can demand no more." *See Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1385, 231 U.S.P.Q. 81, 94-95 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *citing Shatterproof Glass Corp. v. Libbey Owens Ford Co.*, 758 F.2d 613, 624, 225 U.S.P.Q. 634, 641 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100